

ment house is now going up was a wilderness of blackened logs and stumps 10 or 12 feet high—a scene of desolation such as no country outside of B. C. could show.

Third. But the best thing Singletax has done for us is that it has instilled into all our citizens a feeling of Civic Pride. Vancouverites are proud of their city. Let any of your spouters against Singletax in Oregon or Missouri come up here and ask them.

And we have good cause to be proud of her. Of her splendid buildings, her broad thoroughfares, her hustling industrial and commercial activity, and the independence and vigor of her people who have wrought this miracle under the fostering influence of the exemption of enterprise and industry from taxation.

To the people of Oregon and Missouri I say you can do likewise—if you have the courage. God does nothing for people who are afraid to enter the promised land.

JOHN MACMILLAN.



CORRECTION.

By an error in editing, Mr. Hermann's letter in last week's Public at pages 966 and 967, made it appear that the incidents described by him had occurred at Savannah, Mo. They occurred at King City, Mo.—Editors of The Public.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

FREETRADE PRINCIPLE.

Gottingen, Germany.

It is strange how simple facts often escape us for a long time, only to spring suddenly into our consciousness—simple facts that we should have recognized long before.

I have been a Freetrader for a long time. I recognized that as a taxation system the tariff is indefensible. I felt that, as for Protection, the capitalist got the doughnut and the rest of us got the hole. Still, in discussions with Protectionist friends, it never occurred to me to argue that capital, as opposed to capitalists, actually loses by being protected—and that, too, not only from a broad world-wide standpoint but from the narrower national viewpoint.



It is an old dodge and a fair one to take an absolutely simple case which embodies all the principles.

Let us, therefore, imagine two communities so situated, and possessed of such natural resources, that one advantageously produces cotton goods and the other wool.

Suppose that if the entire community of A—produced cotton cloth, the value thereof would be \$10,000 a year, whereas they can produce only \$5,000 worth of wool goods.

B—, on the contrary, can produce \$10,000 worth of wool, and but \$5,000 worth of cotton cloth.

Under a condition of free trade and unrestricted competition A— would devote all its time to cot-

ton, B—to wool, which they would then exchange. Each would thus have \$5,000 worth of both commodities.

But some "patriotic" citizen of A— suggests that home industry should be encouraged.

For this purpose A— carries Protection to its logical extreme and prohibits imports from B—. Half its citizens now go to producing wool, for which the community is but poorly suited. The result is \$5,000 worth of cotton as before, but instead of the \$5,000 worth of wool which B— formerly supplied, the \$2,500 which the half of its workers are able to produce.

Thus the result of this system of "protection" is that with the same number of workers, the same capital, much less is produced.

That is precisely what the nations of the world are doing today—our own land being the worst offender.



I suppose this way of looking at tariff reform is very old and I've no doubt it is elsewhere much better stated. Like many another, I haven't read a great deal that isn't required for the University course. A lot of good things "have to wait" till the strenuousness of college days is exchanged for Life's comparative quiet. The idea came to me with such force that I burned to impart it. It may be that this will catch the eye of others who have never happened to think of this phase of the matter, and another nail be driven in the coffin of an antiquated tax system.



To add a paragraph that is almost entirely foreign, free trade and land reform are pretty well bound up together now in England. Free trade has made England enormously wealthy; a system of land tenure comparable only to that of such enlightened countries as Mexico and Russia has gathered that wealth in the hands of the few. Today, as The Public's correspondents have repeatedly remarked, the land question is almost the only one which excites the English electorate.

Unless the Liberal Party adopts some comprehensive scheme for Land Reform, the Tories, knowing well the value of such a war cry, are going to advance their plan. One can easily imagine how effective a land reform the land-owning aristocracy will bring forward! But by talking of housing, city improvement and a lot of details, and parading themselves as the real friends of the workman, they may well becloud the issue and win.

One shudders to think of the condition of England with her abominable system of land tenure and a high protective tariff. Either is bad; both would be insufferable.

H. B. ENGLISH,
(Rhodes Scholar in Oxford from Nebraska.)



SENATOR OWEN.

Madill, Oklahoma.

Noticing your statement to the effect that Congressmen George and Buchanan were Singletaxers in the House, and that probably Owen was one in the